

676. c. 6
b

B A B Y L O N
IN THE
REVELATION OF ST. JOHN
AS SIGNIFYING THE
CITY OF ROME
CONSIDERED
WITH REFERENCE TO THE CLAIMS OF THE
ROMAN CHURCH.

BY THE LATE REVEREND
THOMAS TOWNSON, D.D.
ARCHDEACON OF RICHMOND; ONE OF THE RECTORS OF
MALPAS, CHESHIRE; AND SOMETIME FELLOW OF ST.
MARY MAGDALEN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

NISI DOMINUS ÆDIFICAVERIT DOMUM, IN VANUM
LABORAUERUNT QUI ÆDIFICANT EAM.
Pfal. cxxvi. al. cxxvii. 1.

OXFORD:
SOLD BY FLETCHER AND CO.
AND BY F. AND C. RIVINGTON, LONDON.
MDCCXCVII.

B A B Y L O N

IN THE

REVOLUTION OF ST. JOHN

A. S. BERNARD

CITY OF ROME

CHRONICLE

IMPRIMATUR

SCROPE BERDMORE,

COLL. MERT.
April. 6, 1797.

VICE-CAN. OXON.

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM

LORD BISHOP OF CHESTER

THIS TRACT IS RESPECTFULLY ADDRESSED

AND TO

THE CONSIDERATION OF ALL

THAT INHABIT THE ARCHDEACONRY :

OF RICHMOND

IS HUMBLY SUBMITTED.

1

TO

THE RIGHT REVEREND

WILLIAM

LOED BISHOP OF CHESTER

THIS TRACT IS RESPECTFULLY ADDRESS'D

AND TO

THE CONSIDERATION OF ALL

THAT ENLIGHTEN THE ARCHDEACONRY

OF RICHMOND

THOMAS J. BURNETT

O Lord Jesus Christ, who didst show to thy
Apostle St. John things that were to come, and
didst command him to write what he had seen for
the edifying of thy Church, Grant that these ob-
servations of thy unworthy servant on a part of his
visions may influence the mind of no one, but as
far as they are agreeable to the true intent of his
prophecy, and may be subservient to thy honour
and glory. Amen.

ERRATUM.

pp. 13. 31: notes, for "No. 1." read No. 3.

T
ha
by
a
pr
gr
th
Ch
oft
je
cir
rat
the
con
full
the

I
Acco

ADVERTISEMENT.

THE following Discourse, as the Public have already been informed ¹, was composed by Dr. Townson, and prepared for the press a few years before his death. Of the interpretation of the Vision which forms the ground of the treatise, and of the validity of the argument thence deduced against the Church of Rome, he was perfectly satisfied, often and carefully as he reviewed the subject, and revised his papers: but a temporary circumstance, which has long ceased, co-operating with his natural modesty, suspended the publication. The work is now, from the corrected copy intrusted to the editor, faithfully printed; not only in compliance with the wishes of one or two highly esteemed

¹ See Dr. Townson's Discourse on our Lord's Resurrection; Account of the Author, p. lxxx.

Friends of the Author, who perused the manuscript before and since the hand was cold that wrote it, but also in full persuasion that He himself, had Providence prolonged his life to this moment, would no longer have withheld his thoughts from the world.

In these days of wonder we have seen, partly at least, verified "*quod apud nostras aures* "ominabatur¹." The arms of France, then tearing her own bowels only, have recently ravaged Italy, and made the sovereign Pontif tremble on his throne—a warning and prelude to that final overthrow, which the Apocalyptic Vision here treated sets before us; when an Earthquake or Volcano perhaps may complete the desolation, which war probably in some shape will begin.

But whatever, in God's appointed time, may be the means and ministers of Rome's visitation, when her smoky and ever-during ruins shall commence; in regard to ourselves, the singularly favoured inhabitants of these islands, few periods in our annals seem to have called for vigilance more loudly than the present; when exiles humanely fostered, and natives justly tolerated, the common sons of one and the same idolatrous, insidious, and

¹ See *ibid.* xxviii.

sanguinary

ADVERTISEMENT.

fanguinary Church, are exerting, in support of a declining cause, all their usual art, and more, if possible, than their usual industry. When the enemy is awake and active, those within the fortress ought not to slumber. At such a juncture therefore, I feel infinite satisfaction that I have it in my power to add to the living works of Dr. Townson these interesting pages, by which "He being dead yet speaketh."

Middleton,
March 23, 1797.

R. CHURTON.

P. S. Since these papers were committed to the press, the Author's surviving brother, John Townson Esquire, of Gray's Inn, one of the Directors of the Honourable East India Company, departed this life, March 3, 1797, aged 72. His affection for the best of brothers erected a neat tablet of marble to the memory of Dr. Townson in the church at Malpas. The inscription, which was not drawn up when the memoirs were compiled, is here submitted to the Reader's indulgence ;
and

and I am happy to add a testimony more worthy of the Deceased, paid to his memory by his esteemed Friend and successor in the Rectory of Blithfield, the Reverend Walter Bagot, M. A.

On

On the South Wall in the Chancel at MALPAS.

The Reverend Thomas Townson D. D.
 Archdeacon of Richmond,
 whose remains are interred, as he directed,
 near the north wall of the church yard,
 was sometime Fellow of
 St. Mary Magdalen College, Oxford,
 and more than forty one years Rector of
 the lower mediety of this Parish ;
 where constant attention
 to the temporal wants and spiritual welfare
 of every rank,
 joined with benignity of mind
 and courtesy of manners,
 gained him universal esteem
 and cordial affection.
 He was learned, humble, pious :
 his writings were distinguished by
 classical elegance, sound argument,
 evangelical purity :
 his devotion
 was fervent without enthusiasm,
 his liberality
 inexhaustible, yet studiously concealed ;
 his cheerfulness invariable,
 and his countenance heavenly.
 His life and death were alike edifying,
 the one was piety, the other peace.
 He expired full of hope in Jesus Christ
 on Sunday evening April 15. 1792.
 aged 77 years.

On a tablet of white marble, with his arms and crest
(quarterly, first and fourth, on a Saltier between 4
Escallops 5 Crosses Crosets; second and third, 5 Crosses
plain and a Chevronel: Crest, on a wreath 3 Crosses
Crosets fitchy, surmounted with an Escallop) against the
South Wall in the Church at BLITHFIELD.

In
Memory of
Thomas Townson D. D.
Rector of this Parish from 1749 to 1759
A learned humble and truly pious Christian
A faithful minister of the Church of God
Which he constantly supported and adorned
both by his Life and Writings
Loved and regretted by all who knew him
He died at Malpas in Cheshire
April 15. 1792 aged 77
and was there buried amidst the sighs and
tears of his afflicted Parishioners.

*Let future Rectors follow if they can
The bright Example of this holy man!*

INTRODUCTION.

OUR blessed Lord promised his Apostles that they should sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel¹; and he exhibited the new Jerusalem to St. John as having twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb². These things suggest an idea of equality among them; and if there was a primacy of order, yet that no one of them had greater authority than the rest.

But if he did indeed appoint St. Peter a prince over his Apostles and universal Church, it no where appears that he invested him with a right of transmitting the plenitude of his power and apostolical supremacy to a successor; or, if that privilege also was allowed him, how the succession was to be kept

N. B. The words at the bottom of the pages, texts of Scripture and a few other instances excepted, refer to the Index.

¹ Matth. xix. 28.

² Rev. xxi. 14.

up, or where it was to be established. On these ~~important articles the New Testament is entirely~~ silent. But if the government of the Church is monarchical, so much it evidently intimates to all the faithful, that they ought to seek their Sovereign in any part of the Christian world rather than at Rome.

This we may infer from a Vision of the Revelation of St. John; confining our argument to a part of the Vision ~~that is sufficiently~~ clear for the purpose, and reasoning from it in the sense which learned interpreters of the Roman Church agree in general to fix upon it.

In maintaining which position I shall endeavour as far as possible to preclude unnecessary disputes about the sense of the texts alleged from Scripture, by citing it according to the Latin version called the Vulgate; which is received as authentic by all who are in communion with the Church of Rome. This version was formerly rendered into English at Doway and Rhemes; and has since been revised and republished, with the proper approbations. The Old Testament came forth in MDCCL, the New in MDCCLII. My quotations from Scripture, and generally my allusions to it, will be in the language of this translation, from the edition just mentioned.

M. B. The words at the bottom of the pages, text of Scrip-
ture and a few other instances excepted, refer to the index.

Rev. xxi. 14.

IN the seventeenth chapter of the Revelation of St. John a woman is exhibited as sitting upon a beast with seven heads and ten horns; and in another view as sitting upon many waters. The woman is intitled, Babylon the Great. In the course of the chapter the symbols of the seven heads, of the ten horns, of the many waters, and lastly of the woman, are interpreted. The woman is said to signify a "great city having kingdom over the kings of the earth."

As far as my argument is concerned in the explication of the symbols that is given by an Angel, the question is, whether he means by the woman one certain city; and if he does, what city it is.

Some have advanced that Babylon signifies the general community of the wicked, which they term the city of the devil, as opposed to the society of the faithful, the city of God. The Christian moralist may, if he pleases, consider Babylon in this light, as St. Augustin has sometimes done*, and raise useful and pious reflections from it. But this is his own construction, not the Angel's exposition of the great city. The end of interpreting is to render things plainer; and this the Angel professes to do: "I will tell thee the mystery of the woman." He then says, "The woman which thou sawest is the great city, which hath kingdom over the kings of the earth." Now a city that exactly answered to this description subsisting when St. John saw the vision, the Angel's inter-

* See Augustin.

pretation turns our thoughts naturally to that city; and if he did not mean it, but something else indefinite and remote, he rather misleads than directs our view. This cannot be the Angel's intention. When he says the symbolical woman is a great ruling city, his words must be understood literally; and when he says that one signification of the seven heads is seven mountains, he must mean seven real mountains: and then this city can be no other than Rome.

Thus Menochius, in a work of learned Dissertations on various subjects, and in his concise notes on Scripture, explains the characters that are given of the great city¹. And in like manner Cornelius a Lapide, having rejected the gloss mentioned above concerning the community of the wicked, with some others, argues that Babylon, described as having kingdom over the kings of the earth, and as having seven mountains, is Rome; the latter circumstance, he says, suiting with no other city. He confirms his argument by the authorities of St. Jerom, of Tertullian, and St. Augustin; and subjoins a catalogue of later writers, who have asserted the same thing². The catalogue might be enlarged with the names of other authors of his own Church, but that it is needless. "Rome," as a learned Prelate of the Gallican Church has observed, "is so plainly marked out under the figure of Babylon, that the enigma is easy to be deciphered"³.

¹ Menochius.

² A Lapide, No. 1.

³ Bossuet, No. 1.

The two notes so characteristic of Rome, its empire and seven hills, are thus united by Propertius in a verse often cited on this occasion :

Septem urbs alta jugis, toti quæ præsidet orbi.

Propert. l. iii. x. 57.

The city raised on seven hills, that rules over the whole earth.

But to these marks the Angel adds a third, the many waters upon which the woman sat. "The waters," he says, "are peoples, and nations, and tongues." But he did not show St. John the things signified, but only the symbol of them, "The waters which thou sawest:" which he interprets as has been just mentioned.

Now though the Tiber is a river more famous in history and poetry than considerable in itself, ancient Rome abounded in waters, for which she was renowned, I presume, above every city upon the face of the earth. Her artificial rivers fetched from afar, and conveyed by aqueducts on noble arches, were such mighty works, that in the age of Augustus, when they were not yet brought to the perfection in which St. John might see them, Strabo the geographer acknowledged in them the wisdom of the Romans¹, and Dionysius the historian the greatness of the Roman empire².

The following remark has been made on modern Rome :

¹ Strabo, b. v. p. 360. Ed. Amsterdam.

² Dionys. Halicarn. b. iii. p. 191. Ed. Hudson.

“ There is nothing that delights a stranger
 “ more in Rome, than to see the great fountains of
 “ water that are almost in every corner of it. That
 “ old aqueduct, which Paul V. restored, cometh
 “ from a collection of sources five and thirty miles
 “ distant from Rome, that runs all the way upon
 “ an aqueduct in a channel that is vaulted, and is
 “ liker a river than a fountain. It breaketh out
 “ in five several fountains; of which some give
 “ water about a foot square. That of Sixtus the
 “ Fifth; the great fountain of Acqua Trevi,
 “ that hath yet no decoration, but dischargeth a
 “ prodigious quantity of water; the glorious foun-
 “ tain in the Piazza Navona, that hath an air of
 “ greatness in it that surpriseth one; the fountain
 “ in the Piazza di Spagna; those before St. Pe-
 “ ter’s and the Palazzo Farnese, with many
 “ others, furnish Rome so plentifully, that almost
 “ every private house hath a fountain that runs
 “ continually. All these, I say, are noble decora-
 “ tions, that carry an usefulness with them that
 “ cannot be enough commended.”

Since the time of Bishop Burnet, whose letter
 from Rome that has this passage is dated Decem-
 ber 8th, MDCLXXXV, the fountain of Trevi has
 been highly decorated, at the expence of Clement
 XII. and Benedict XIV¹.

But Rome, the sight of whose fountains and
 waters so delighted this traveller, has now only

¹ See Venuti, No. 2, 3.

three aqueducts : in the time of St John it had nine, which were afterwards increased to fourteen¹, built with great magnificence at an amazing cost, and conveying a wonderful quantity of water to the city.

The elder Pliny speaks of them in the following terms : If any one take a careful survey of the store of waters, with which the public, the baths, the fish-pools, houses, canals, gardens, suburbs, and adjacent villas, are supplied ; of the arches raised, the mountains bored, the vallies filled up, to form a course for these waters, he must confess that there is nothing more stupendous in the whole earth.

Plin. Nat. Hist. book xxxvi. chap. xv.

Many waters therefore were a distinguishing feature of Rome ; and as they flowed as she directed, and were as obedient to her command, as the peoples, and nations, and tongues which they represented, she might be said to sit upon them with the strictest propriety of symbolical language : since to sit upon is a known emblem of governing.

Thus Babylon is clearly Rome, that is the City of Rome, according to the authors with whom I am ready to join issue upon this point, the City as distinguished from the Hierarchy established in it.

But whether the claims of this Hierarchy stand unaffected by the prophecy concerning the city, is

¹ See Fabretti.

still a question ; which I shall endeavour to discuss under the following heads of inquiry :

I. To what prerogatives does the Roman Church hold itself intitled, as granted to it by Christ ?

II. If such prerogatives have indeed been granted to that Church by him, under what character must the City of Rome be considered by his people ?

III. What character has our Lord himself given of this City in his written word ?

IV. Is the character of Rome given by Christ consistent with the character of it resulting from the prerogatives claimed by its Church, and ascribed to it by its friends ?

V. If the two characters are inconsistent with each other, is it credible that our Lord has vested such high prerogatives in a Church established in Rome ?

SECTION I.

To what prerogatives does the Roman Church hold itself intitled, as granted to it by Christ?

CARDINAL BELLARMINE, in treating of the Roman Pontifs, tells us, that they must peculiarly well understand the authority of their own See¹. Let us therefore hear them speak for themselves from their apostolical chair.

“ He who reigneth on high, to whom all power
“ is given in heaven and in earth, hath committed
“ the one holy Catholic and Apostolical Church,
“ out of which there is no salvation, to be go-
“ verned with plenitude of power by one only
“ on earth; namely, by Peter the prince of the
“ Apostles, and by the successor of Peter the Ro-
“ man Pontif. This one he hath constituted a
“ prince over all nations and all kingdoms; to
“ pluck up, waste, destroy, plant, and build.”

They are the words of Pope Pius the Fifth, in his Bull against Queen Elizabeth; towards the conclusion of which, “ Supported,” he says, “ by
“ the authority of Him who hath seen fit to place
“ him, however unequal to so great a charge, in
“ this supreme throne of justice, he declares, in the
“ plenitude of his apostolical authority, the said
“ Elizabeth laid under a sentence of anathema,
“ deprived of all right and title to her kingdom,

¹ Bellarmine, No. 1.

“ her

“ her subjects absolved from all oaths of allegiance
 “ to her, and those who obey her involved in the
 “ like sentence of anathema¹.”

The high hand of sovereignty, that is here held over one kingdom, is more widely extended in another Bull, which was re-modeled and brought to its present perfection by Pope Urban the Eighth²; from whose time it has been usual, at least till of late years, to publish it annually, from the portico of St. Peter's, on the Thursday in Passion-week; and that day being in the language of the Latin Church *In cæna Domini*, the Bull from thence took its name. That the contents of this Bull, *In cæna Domini*, may be known not only at Rome, but throughout the Christian Church, it lays a strict charge on all patriarchs, primates, archbishops, prelates, and ordinaries, in virtue of their holy obedience, to read, or cause it to be read, once a year at least in their churches, when there is the greatest concourse of people for divine worship. The manner in which it speaks to the highest orders in the church is in the usual style of the Roman Pontiffs to them. But beyond this it stretches the rod of its authority over all the secular princes and powers of the Christian world; who, if they violate any of those extensive rights, which the See of Rome reserves to itself as ecclesiastical immunities, incur an anathema; the consequence of which to those, who die without a

¹ Bulls Papal, No. 1.

² Bulls Papal, No. 2.

proper release from it, is in the account of the Canonists everlasting perdition.

These two Bulls show chiefly the power of the Roman Pontif to root up, waste, and destroy ; but as armed with the plenitude of power, which he derives from the Prince of Peace, as successor of St. Peter, he is no doubt invested with equal ability to plant and build. The powers of loosing as well as of binding must be in his hands. But what his power of loosing is on earth, and how far it reaches beyond into the invisible world, it is not here necessary to inquire. Nor need I mention his well known claim to infallibility in matters of faith ; and to a power superior to all general councils ; to which an appeal from the Roman See is forbidden in the Bull, *In cæna Domini*, under penalty of an anathema.

It is sufficient for the present purpose to have given this sketch of the prerogatives which he asserts to be his right ; and which all true sons of his Church think it necessary to attribute to him. " Among the Catholics," Cardinal Orsi says, " there is no one who dares deny, or can deny, " that Jesus Christ has instituted a Monarchy, or " form of monarchical government, in his Church, " and that the supreme head of this monarchy is " the Roman Pontif¹." This is declared with great solemnity from the portico of St. Peter's church, in the presence of a numerous assembly at

¹ See Orsi, No. 1.

the coronation of a Pope ; when a cardinal deacon having taken the mitre from his head, another places on it the triple crown, and says, “ Receive
 “ this tiara adorned with three crowns, and know
 “ that thou art Father of princes and kings, Governor of the globe of earth, Vicegerent of our
 “ Saviour Jesus Christ.” In conjunction with such a head, “ the Roman Church is the mother
 “ and mistress of all Churches.”

SECTION II.

If such prerogatives have been granted to the Roman Church by Christ, under what character must the City of Rome be considered by his people ?

IT must be indeed venerable in their eyes, if it is the established metropolis of a kingdom to which all nations of believers are to flow.

Now we are told, that when St. Peter retired from Jerusalem, he set his apostolical chair first in Antioch, and that having governed the Church for some years in that city, he thence removed to Rome¹, and having here fixed this chair, entailed the plenitude of his power on his successors in it for ever. He did so, in the opinion of Cardinal Bellarmine, by command of the Lord² : and if we admit the fact as it is stated, we cannot dispute the reason assigned for it. The blessed Apostle

¹ Stato di Roma, No. 1.

² See Liber Pontificalis.

³ See Bellarmine, No. 2.

would

would not engage in a measure of such magnitude of his own accord, or without special instructions from his Divine Master. It is declared also by papal authority to be the place which the Lord hath chosen ¹.

On this foot our Lord has chosen Rome in preference to the city in which his faithful people were first called Christians ²; and has exalted it not only above Antioch, but above all the cities of the world.

He hath given it the inheritance of that apostolical chair, to which he has annexed the sovereignty of his Church; and what he has established in it, nothing short of his own express order can remove to another place.

He has vested the right of electing Him who is to fill this chair in the faithful of this city, or in those who bear a sacred relation to it. For the Cardinals, to whom the nomination of him is now limited, were originally the chief pastors of the Churches in Rome, and have still a kind of episcopal superintendence and care of their respective Churches, or Titles as they are called ³, to which regularly and generally they are appointed on their advancement to their dignity; except six, who are consecrated bishops of certain Sees in the province or neighbourhood of Rome. And the same persons, who create the “King and Father of the

¹ See Bulls Papal, No. 1.

² Acts xi. 26.

³ Stato di Roma, No. 2.

“ Christian

"Christian community¹," are his standing Council in the government of it².

He has made Rome the centre of union to all his people throughout the world; and all the bishops and archbishops of his Church are bound to repair thither, and to visit the thresholds of the Apostles (the shrines of St. Peter and St. Paul being there) once in three years, personally if they are able, or else by some dignified representative. To this purpose an oath is prescribed in the Roman Pontifical, which is to be administered to them at the time of their consecration³.

We might enumerate abundance of other sacred privileges, which together with many secular emoluments accrue to Rome from the possession of St. Peter's chair. But what has been already said may serve to prove that this chair, which elevates the Church above all churches, raises the City to a sacred pre-eminence above all cities. The honours and advantages that it communicates to them are distinct, but of perpetual connection, and involve each other. Where this chair is fixed, there is fixed the sovereignty of the Church universal; and where this sovereignty is, there is the metropolis of Christ's visible kingdom: and such a metropolis, as appointed by him, must be regarded by his people as his chosen and holy city. In this light it is considered by those who ac-

¹ Medals Papal, No. 1.

² Trent, Council, No. 1.

³ Pontificale Romanum.

knowledge the supremacy of the Roman Church. A learned author, Cornelius a Lapide, speaks of Rome as being, “ since Constantine, The holy and
“ faithful city, the Sion beloved of God, the pil-
“ lar of the faith, the mother of piety, the mistress
“ of sanctity¹.” Another, Jacobus Gutherius, inscribes his work, “ To Rome eternal, the first
“ of cities, metropolis of the earth, patroness of
“ virtues, assertress of law and equity, venerable
“ miracle of antiquity, victorious, powerful, au-
“ gust, pious, happy, ever regenerated, ever rising
“ again².”

A much earlier and more dignified writer, Leo the Great, in a sermon on the festival of St. Peter and St. Paul, thus addresses himself to Rome :

“ These are they who have raised thee to this
“ glory, that as a holy nation, a chosen people, a
“ sacerdotal and royal city, being made the head
“ of the earth through the sacred chair of the
“ blessed Peter, thou shouldest rule more exten-
“ sively by divine religion than by earthly terri-
“ tory³.”

Rome, thus ennobled again by an universal so-
vereignty, of a different nature from the former,
but, as it is presumed, of greater permanency, is
still intitled, *The Eternal City*.

But let us now inquire,

¹ A Lapide, No. 2.

² Gutherius.

³ Pontifs Roman, No. 1.

SECTION III.

What character has our Lord himself given of this City in his written word?

WE meet with the name of Rome, or circumstances relating to it, in different parts of the New Testament, but nothing to the purpose of our inquiry till we come to the Revelation of St. John.

It is without the least private satisfaction that we produce the things which are there spoken of a City renowned in the annals of Christian as well as Pagan history : which, though it has endured some rude shocks since the time of its imperial splendour, is yet the admiration of mankind, and esteemed to be replete with the noblest monuments of ancient and modern art. It was the chief nursery and seat of literature for a long tract of time in the Western world¹. It abounds in pious and charitable institutions ; and as the faith of its first Christian converts was “ spoken of in the whole world²,” it hath, I hope, in no subsequent period wanted devout and zealous servants of our common Lord.

But since we are to show how this City is represented in the Revelation, we must endeavour to be guided by it without prejudice or affection.

¹ Bonamici, No. 1.

² Rom. i. 8.

And when we consider the length of the vision concerning Rome ; that there is such an explication given of the symbols used in it, as is found but in one other part of the book, in the mystery of the seven stars and seven golden candlesticks, chap. i. 20. and that the explication is thus introduced, " Here is the understanding that hath wisdom," we must conclude that the importance of the vision and its consequences is thus signified, and a serious attention to it meant to be excited in the faithful.

We proceed then to give an abstract of it.

Rev. chap. xvii. Rome reigning over the kings of the earth is intitled Babylon the Great, and is exhibited under the symbol of a woman that is called the great Harlot, and is represented with a golden cup of intoxication in her hand ; as rich and splendid in her appearance ; corrupted, and corrupting the princes and people of the earth ; and at the same time cruel and sanguinary towards the saints and servants of Christ. It is predicted moreover that God, in his appointed time, will raise up certain powers that " shall hate the " Harlot," shall spoil her of all her glory and possessions, and shall burn her with fire.

Ch. xviii. Judgement is then transferred from the emblematical woman, yet without dropping the figure altogether, to the real city ; and Babylon is described as indulging in all the luxuries and vices, to which opulence and power are incitements ; as elated with pride and vain glory ;

C

and

and filled with confidence of her perpetual stability and prosperity. But the sins of Babylon reaching unto Heaven, it is doomed to excision and desolation for ever.

When the Revelation was written, there were other great cities that might vie with Rome in many of her sins and vices, and in enmity to the Church of Christ. What is given us as characteristic of Western Babylon, from a resemblance of spirit to Eastern Babylon of old, is *pride of Sovereignty, and conceit of Indefeasibility*. “She saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am not a widow, and I shall see no mourning.” Rev. xviii. 7. Compare Isai. xlvii. 8.

These thoughts of her heart her great poet represents as ratified by their supreme Deity :

The people Roman call, the city Rome.

To them no bounds of empire I assign,

Nor term of years to their immortal line.

Aeneid, b. i. ver. 377. of Dryden's Transl.

SECTION IV.

Is this character of Rome given by Christ consistent with the character of it resulting from the prerogatives claimed by its Church, and ascribed to it by its friends ?

IT is certain that the two characters are incompatible with each other at the same time, and can only be both true by a succession of one to the other.

other. But analogy of Scripture, and the conduct of the Revelation, forbid us to regard Rome as in any period intitled to the character of the chosen and holy City.

The Roman Pontiffs consider their City and Hierarchy together as the Jerusalem and Sion of Christians. But if Heaven has ordained such a sacred metropolis to Them also, should not the authority of the appointment be as apparent as it was to the Jewish Church?

The Almighty, who had apprized his people by Moses that he would choose a place out of their tribes to place his name there and to dwell in, Deut. xii. 5. having decreed Jerusalem to be that place, notified his choice of it to them. He declared it to be his chosen and holy City, the city of the great King, the city of the Lord. If this Jerusalem was treated severely by his prophets, when iniquity abounded in it, the faithful in Israel could notwithstanding rest on divine assurances, that it was the place which the Lord had chosen; where his priests were to offer their sacrifices, and the representative of Aaron to make atonement for them; where they were to hold their solemn festivals, and expect a blessing on their devotions.

And these assurances Heaven was solicitous, if I may so speak, to keep alive in their thoughts. Gracious promises of pardon and favour were subjoined to the decrees concerning the desolation of

* See Medals Papal, No. 146.

Jerusalem and Sion. Both were to be restored within a limited time, and reinstated in their former rights. And after the return of the captivity from Babylon, an express renewal of sacred privileges was made to both : Zech. i. 16. and again viii. 3. "Thus saith the Lord of Hosts ; I am returned to Sion, and I will dwell in the midst of
 " Jerusalem. And Jerusalem shall be called the
 " city of truth, and the mountain of the Lord of
 " Hosts, the sanctified mountain."

So full and indisputable was Jerusalem's patent of consecration. If Rome could produce the like, I hope we should duly reverence it. But the Son of God has in no passage of his New Testament declared it the city of righteousness ; he has no where promised that he would dwell in the midst of it, that it should be called the city of truth ; nor has he fixed on any of its mountains as the mountain of the Lord of Hosts.

In one instance he speaks of it in terms that recall Jerusalem to mind. He directed St. John to describe its future desolation in language and images that had been suggested to Jeremiah in prophesying against Jerusalem, either by itself, or as involved in one condemnation with the bordering cities and countries¹. But even in these sentences of destruction there is a marked difference between the two cities. Jerusalem, laid in ashes

¹ Compare Jer. vii. 34. xvi. 9. xxv. 10. with Rev. xviii. 22, 23.

and emptied of inhabitants, was to be rebuilt and re-peopled. Rome desolated is to rise "no more at all."

This is not the whole of the argument against any sacred pretensions of Rome. It cannot be regarded by the people of our Lord as his holy City, as long as he himself treats it as Babylon. How much then of the duration of Rome does he cover with that name and character? His Revelation represents it only as Babylon dominant, Babylon fallen, and Babylon lying in ruins. Its glory, catastrophe, and desolation, are set before us in a connected succession, and together occupy the whole space from the commencement of the vision to the end of time. During this extensive period, with whatever changes of government it may be diversified, we are presented with a certain continuity of Babylon. For what is that, the sudden fall of which is described by St. John, but Babylon which he had seen in great splendour? What is that, the smoke of which ascendeth for ever and ever, but the same Babylon prostrate, which till then had been so elevated? Thus the matter is stated to us in "the Revelation of Jesus Christ;" and what prophet of Bethel shall we trust to tell us of another word of the Lord, ordering Rome to be Jerusalem, when in his open and declared word it is exhibited as only Babylon, from first to last?

* 1st aliter 3d Kings xiii. 11—18.

A view has now been taken of two opposite characters of the same city ; and no proof being needful that both cannot be true together, it has been inquired whether they could be successively true. But a season is not to be found, in which Rome may, consistently with the prophecy, bear the title of the chosen and holy City ; not only for want of the proper evidence to support such pretensions, but because it appears to stand never clear of the character of Babylon.

SECTION V.

Is it then credible that Christ has conferred a Sovereignty over all his people on a Church established in a City, which he teaches them to consider only as Babylon ?

A CHURCH intitled to all the graces and benefits of the Christian covenant, and to the respect and communion of the universal Church, might abide in Babylon as well as in Pergamos, “ where the seat of Satan was.” But when one Church talks of its Sovereignty over all the rest, the question then is, not what are her claims to their esteem and communion, but what are her pretensions to authority over them. And if the Church “ which is in Babylon” makes these claims, her title to be the “ mother and mistress “ of all Churches,” and her right to the subjection

tion of these, as her daughters and hand-maidens, ought to be particularly well ascertained.

Appeals have been made on both sides of the question to the sentiments of the early fathers, Greek and Latin; who have been construed on one part to maintain the supremacy of the Roman Church, and on the other to have acted on principles that showed an unconsciousness of any subordination due to it. It is no part of my plan to enter into this dispute: yet one testimony, though it has often been urged, I cannot help repeating.

Towards the close of the sixth century, when John, Archbishop of Constantinople, assumed the title of Œcumenical Patriarch, or Universal Bishop, a great and learned bishop of Rome, Gregory the First, exclaimed loudly against such a title. And this he did, as he himself testifies, not because it was an usurpation on the prerogatives of his own See, but because it was an invasion of the rights of every See in the Christian world. Do I in this, he said, defend my own cause? Do I remonstrate against a special injury? Do I not rather assert the cause of Almighty God, and of the universal Church? This title, which John took with the approbation of a Council, and the allowance of the emperor Mauritius, seems to have been more an accession of honour than power. At least the power conveyed with it was far inferior to that, which the bishops of Rome have claimed under the

¹ See Pontifs Roman, No. 2.

notion of their supremacy. This, therefore, Gregory did much more condemn, who inveighed against the title and claims of universal bishop, as proud, heretical, blasphemous, and antichristian. Sufficiently jealous of the dignity of his own See, yet so unconscious was he of a Sovereignty over the whole Church, that he protested against it.

Very different was the language of one of his successors, Gregory the Seventh¹, in the time of our William the Conqueror, who, as Philip Bonamici remarks, first introduced an ampler form of pontifical government, and set on foot those measures that might render the Pontiffs not only respectable, but formidable to princes². The twenty seven Dictates of this pope are famous; and though some deny that they were drawn up by him in their present form, yet they who have examined the matter assure us, that the greatest part of them is found word for word in his Epistles³.

What shall we say then, when opposite interpretations are given us of the sentiments of the ancient Fathers; when they, who should “ peculiarly well understand the authority of their “ own See,” give such different accounts of it as Gregory the First and Gregory the Seventh; when Boniface the Third, the next successor but one of the first Gregory, entertained so contrary a notion of the title of Universal Bishop,

¹ See Pontiffs Roman, No. 4.

² See Bonamici, No. 2.

³ See Contini, No. 2.

that

that he solicited it for himself from the Constantinopolitan emperor Phocas, and assumed it¹; and when, if we look to later times, we shall find one Council claiming a superiority over Popes, and another owning a subordination to them²? How shall well disposed Christians, who have not leisure or learning to examine remote antiquities of the Church, and to weigh the arguments deduced from them, satisfy their minds, whether it is the will of God or not, that they should obey the Roman Pontif as supreme in authority, and infallible in doctrine? How, but by recourse to the written word of God; if he has there vouchsafed, as might humbly be hoped in such a case, to give them any plain indications of his will in this matter? To this written word let us return our inquiry.

Some passages of Scripture have, with great dexterity of comment, been made to declare for the supremacy of St. Peter over the apostolical College and universal Church. But the most ingenious expositor will not find the shadow of a proof in the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, or Canonical Epistles, that St. Peter, supposing him invested with such a sovereignty and a right of transmitting it, was to bequeath it to the Roman Church. If he means Rome by Babylon in the close of his first Epistle³, he shows that he wrote it in Rome, and testifies, that the Roman Church was elected

¹ See Pontifs Rom. No. 3.

² See Constance.

³ 1 Pet. v. 13.

into the communion of saints together with other Churches ; but he gives not the least hint that it was, or was to be, supreme over them. We must therefore seek the resolution of our question in the Revelation of St. John.

The Revelation is the prophetic history of the kingdom of Christ, shadowing out the great concerns of it, its chief protectors, adversaries, and events, from an early date to its consummation in glory. Among the visible agents, by means of whom the affairs of this kingdom are carried on, the Roman Church stands forth, as its friends represent it, most eminent, as the mother and mistress of all Churches ; over all the visible members of which it claims a monarchical authority ; and in this view its chief pastor is the most exalted character on earth. Supreme over all the Churches and their Angels, he is as “ a Cherub stretching
“ out his wings and covering, and set in the holy
“ mountain of God ¹.” To him is committed
“ to root up, waste, destroy, plant, and build ;”
and “ the nation and kingdom that will not serve
“ him shall perish ².” What then is said or signified in the Revelation concerning this Church ? Let the question be answered by a Prelate of shining abilities, eloquence, and acuteness, who lived in communion with it, and wrote a comment on the Revelation of St. John. His answer is, “ It

¹ See the English Version of the Vulgate, Ezekiel xxviii. 14.

² See Medals Papal, No. 2.

“ is a Church of which there is not the least trace
 “ in all his book 1.”

A total silence of his book concerning a Church of such high and singular pretensions is a circumstance most striking; whether we consider that Church with reference to some others, or to its own peculiar situation.

Our Lord makes the following promise in the Revelation to the Church at Thyatira: “ Yet
 “ that which you have, hold fast till I come. And
 “ he that shall overcome, and keep my words unto
 “ the end, I will give him power over the na-
 “ tions.” Rev. ii. 25, 26. And this to the Church of Philadelphia: “ Behold, I will bring
 “ them of the synagogue of Satan, who say they
 “ are Jews and are not, but do lie; behold, I
 “ will make them come and worship before thy
 “ feet, and they shall know that I have loved
 “ thee.” Ibid. iii. 9.

The Roman Church, placed on the most conspicuous theatre in the world, had to contend with Jews, and with equally malignant and more powerful Gentiles. It felt the fury of Nero, who first drew the imperial sword against the Christians. It was bleeding under the cruelty of Domitian, or very lately come out of great tribulation, at the time, as it is generally allowed, in which St. John saw the visions of the Revelation 2. In these and succeeding perilous days it testified its zeal and

1 See Bossuet, No. 2.

2 Dalrymple, Sir David.

fidelity

fidelity in the cause of Christ, by the fortitude of
 its numerous confessors and martyrs; and was
 earnest for the purity as well as truth of the Gos-
 pel. After a long resistance unto blood it was
 rendered victorious, and subdued to the obedi-
 ence of the faith the sons of those fathers who had
 been its bitter persecutors. Yet, copious as the
 vision is with respect to the place of that Church's
 abode, it makes not the least mention of the
 Church itself. Might not this awaken a suspi-
 cion, that no commendation is bestowed on its
 earlier love, that no handle may be given to its
 later ambition? Thus much we may remark with
 certainty and without presumption: If it is a
 Church, "of which there is not the least trace in
 "all the book," that no promise is there made it
 of "power over the nations;" and that "its foes
 "shall come and worship before its feet;" no
 testimony is borne to it of Christ's affection for it,
 nor assurance given that "they shall know that
 "he hath loved it." I presume no prudent friend
 of the Roman Church will dispute the decision of
 Bossuet, that the Revelation is totally silent con-
 cerning it. But this is a silence that abandons
 the sovereignty of that Church to all the objec-
 tions, that may result from the non-confirmation
 of its authority, and the attainure of its city.

Suppose now the Monarch of an extensive em-
 pire to have in his public acts treated the chief city
 of a remote province in a manner not unsimilar to
 that in which Rome is treated by the Revelation,
 and

and to have been as reserved about the powers vested in its magistrates, as the same book is with regard to the Roman Hierarchy: if nevertheless the governors, whom he had set to preside in that city and its proper district, and whom he allowed to succeed by election among themselves, should after a while¹ take upon them to announce to the surrounding provinces, that he had made them supreme over that whole circle of his dominions, as the delegates of his sovereignty, the interpreters of his will, and dispensers of his favours, and that whoever did not obey them throughout that extent of country would incur his indignation; the inhabitants of the provinces that lay without the boundary of the city which claimed such subjection from them might reasonably observe, that the wisdom and benignity of their Sovereign had provided the best of laws and constitutions for the welfare of his people; and if knowing all things he did not see proper to interpose openly in all², he laid the stricter obligation on all ranks and degrees of his subjects in their several departments to study his will contained in those his ordinances, and promote the due performance of it: that, on consulting his ordinances, they could not discover any commissions granted by him to the governors of one province of high authority over the governors of others³; and if authority is

¹ See Pontifs Rom. No. 5.

² Omnia scire, non omnia exequi. Tacit. in Vit. Agricolaë, cap. xix.

³ See Febronius, No. 1. Contini, No. 3.

claimed.

claimed which is entirely out of the common course of his administration, the evidence ought to be unquestionable that it issued from him.

The delegation of the sovereign's prerogatives to a subject is a rare instance of trust and confidence in him; and if they are vested in him as the magistrate of one peculiar city, it is a token of royal favour to the city itself, and must be the source of great respect and advantage to it. But how, might they say, can we conceive the city in question to have been thus distinguished by our august Sovereign, when it stands charged with high crimes and misdemeanors, and is marked with a sentence of perpetual disgrace, in the records of his empire? When he has declared that whenever he shall permit it to be destroyed, a multitude of his faithful subjects will rejoice in its downfall¹; and when he has even discountenanced their intercourse with it²? But if, for reasons which we are incompetent to judge of, it had pleased him to establish the most dignified representative of his own majesty in such a city, he would doubtless have given us plain indications of his will, and directions for our conduct, which might serve us as a clue to thread the maze of bringing honour to his substitute, and yet of standing aloof from the city of his residence. But after diligent search throughout the venerable code of laws and constitutions, which are the standard and measure of our

¹ See Rev. xviii. 20. xix. 1—3.

² Ib. xviii. 4.
obedience,

obedience, we discover nothing there that may lead us to the submission exacted of us. The magistrates established in that city are not raised above others. The city itself is degraded below every place in the empire, without repeal or qualification of the sentence passed upon it.

All this considered, we hold ourselves bound in reason, and in duty to our sovereign, not to resign the liberty with which he has blest us, to such wonderful pretensions of a paramount undefined jurisdiction over us and our respective governors.

But to come from suppositions to the statement of facts in the word of prophecy.

Our Lord there represents Rome to us as Babylon, as Babylon only. Out of reverence to Him, therefore, we dare not consider it as holy and beloved by him, lest we should allow the sanction of his authority to two contradictory characters of the same city.

We dare not assent to that Roman Pontif, who calls his See, to which he invites the faithful, that is, Rome, "The place which the Lord hath chosen"; when the Lord himself marks it as the place, from which "a voice from heaven bids them go out." Whether the occasion of the voice be past or future is disputed by their learned. And a warning from heaven, that can be limited to no one certain time, is alarming in all.

* See Bulls Papal, No. 1.

Yet

Yet were the prerogatives of St. Peter's chair such in truth as are arrogated to it, Rome ought to be prized among Christians as much as Jerusalem was by the Jews. For what place on earth could we conceive to be so worthy of our veneration as the metropolis of Christ's visible kingdom, the seat of his oracle, the centre of union and worship appointed by himself to all his subjects; and whither all estates of men, from every region under heaven, were to bring their homage and offerings?

See barb'rous nations at thy gates attend,
Walk in thy light, and in thy temple bend;
See thy bright altars throng'd with prostrate kings;
And heap'd with products of Sabea springs.

Pope's Messiah.

The misfortune is, that the more we exalt the dignity of the City to make it correspond with that idea of its Hierarchy, the more we set it at variance with the Revelation. And thus our Lord has in a signal manner denied the Church claiming the grant of a Sovereignty from him the analogous and natural adjunct of such a Sovereignty, an answerable respectability of its City.

If nevertheless he had seen fit to erect this spiritual monarchy in Rome, his tender solicitude for the right institution of his people assures us, he would have provided for an extraordinary case, and have so modified his Vision concerning Babylon, that his supreme Church should sustain no loss of dignity,

dignity, nor his faithful be startled at submission to her, because he had perpetually reprobated the place with which her Supremacy was united. But is there this modification of the Vision to be discovered in any part of the book? So far is he from testifying his delight to honour the Roman Church above all his Churches, or even as he has honoured some others, that, as a Master has decided, There is not the least trace of it in all the Revelation.

But is not the observation just, that “ Pagan Rome is one thing, and Christian Rome another?” Undoubtedly it is just in itself, but of no use in reasoning from a book that affords no opening for the distinction between them, and knows as little of Christian Rome as of the Roman Church, notwithstanding the small proportion the Paganism of the city bears to its Christianity since the date of the prophecy. The fact is as certain as it is remarkable. If we follow the general, and as it seems the best grounded, opinion², that the Revelation was not written earlier than the year of our Lord XCV, scarce two hundred and twenty years passed before the Cross of Christ triumphed in Rome under Constantine; from whose days, the short reign of Julian excepted, it has been ruled by Christian emperors, kings, or governors, for above fourteen centuries and an half; and for a thousand of these years has been united in one faith under one line of princes, the Roman Pon-

¹ See a Lapide, No. 3.

² See Dalrymple.

tifs¹. And though Paganism was not immediately extinguished when Constantine professed himself a Christian, it declined gradually, and came to nothing; and its prevalence in Rome cannot well be estimated a fifth of the space from the year of our Lord XCV to the present time. Yet of this large excess of better ages the Revelation takes no notice; but the whole of it is hidden from the eyes of the faithful by the Babylonian mantle that is wrapped round Rome.

Once more: the fall of Babylon is asserted by some to have happened long ago; by others it is referred to the last age of the world. On either hypothesis Rome is disqualified by the Revelation for being in any age intitled to the character that it should bear, if the Sovereignty of its Church were founded in truth.

If we say with Bossuet², the improver of the plan of Grotius, that when Rome was taken and sacked in the year CCCCX by Alaric king of the Goths, Babylon was then destroyed and obliterated; what should follow to denote that the City of God sprang out of the ashes of Babylon? What, but that "its light was come, and the glory of the Lord was risen upon it?" But on the fall of Babylon what does in deed follow? Her ruins are given up to hateful creatures, and "her smoke ascendeth for ever and ever." Whatever this symbolical smoke may be, the perpetual continu-

¹ See Orsi, No. 2.

² See Bossuet, No. 3.

³ Isai. lx. 1.

ance of it is a token, that the judgement inflicted has not yet quitted the site of Babylon, but abides upon it.

But if we follow the more general sentiments of expositors¹, we must suppose that about the time of the great Antichrist some Pagan power will again prevail in Rome; and the city, which rose in idolatry, will set in apostasy; that as it was Babylon in the former of these states, so it will be in the latter, and will then be destroyed and exterminated; but since it ceased to be Pagan, and till it shall renounce, and again persecute, the faith, that it is by way of eminence the holy and beloved City. Unfulfilled prophecy is often of uncertain interpretation; and as we cannot foresee the wonderful and sudden vicissitudes of human affairs, we cannot affirm that to be impossible which seems so improbable, that the unhappy change, which these expositors speak of, should ever take place in Rome, and dethroned Paganism resume its sceptre there. But we need not pry into futurity to discover the vanity of the other proposition, that Rome, while it is Christian, is the holy and beloved City: we have only to compare this comment with the text, and to consider what on this hypothesis the Revelation does. It passes over the long intermediate glories of the City as beloved, and of the Church as supreme; and displays only the two evil extremes, the first and final Babylo-

¹ See a Lapide, No. 1, 2. and Menochius.

nian condition of Rome. It were bold indeed to suppose this conduct of a book dictated by the Holy Spirit to have been undesigned.

On every view of the subject this conclusion forces itself on a common apprehension, that our Lord, by what he has spoken of Rome as Babylon, and not spoken of either its Church or City as Christian, gives us to understand, that he has not chosen the one for his Jerusalem, nor the other for his Sion.

Is this a wrong construction of his meaning? Does he enjoin obedience to the Roman Hierarchy as the duty of all that believe in him; and yet has he by his Revelation, which he exhorts them to read, led them into such danger of misconceiving his blessed will?

It is not so that the gracious Saviour of the world teaches his people what they are to do, that they may enter into life. The rules which he has given them for that end are not involved in ambiguities, but plain and simple. The principles of their religious duty are proposed to them clearly and consistently: and he does not enforce that in one part of his word, which in another he discourages. We may therefore rest assured, that what stands in full opposition to the whole tenor of his proceedings with them is not his institution, but is imposed upon them as such by art and device of man; and that the donation of a Supremacy to the Roman Church by Christ our Lord, rests on no better a bottom than the donation of Italy to it

it by Constantine the Great : which is now tacitly disavowed ¹, or openly rejected, by their ablest writers ², as the figment of a barbarous age.

CONCLUSION.

HAVING seen on what grounds the claims of the Roman Church are refuted by the Revelation, we may discern, in part at least, why it makes no provision for exempting the long period of Christian Rome from the name of Babylon.

Rome is called on medals of several emperors the Eternal City ³. Ammianus Marcellinus in his history ⁴, and Valentinian III in an imperial edict ⁵, speak the same language ; they intitle the Roman Pontif “ Bishop of the Eternal City.” And notwithstanding the censure of St. Jerom upon calling that eternal which is but temporal ⁶, the modern Romans do not care to part with the epithet ; while the bishop of their Church applies to his own See the promise made by Christ to his Church in general, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Now pride of Sovereignty, and conceit of Indefectibility, were characteristic marks of ancient Babylon. The like spirit transmitted from the East to the West, and from old to mo-

¹ See Orsi, No. 2.

² See Muratori.

³ See Medals Imperial.

⁴ See Marcellinus.

⁵ See Newton.

⁶ See St. Jerom.

dern Rome, a bishop who says his See is Supreme, and can never fail reigning in a City that calls itself Eternal, may make the name of Babylon suitable even to Christian Rome.

Learned men in communion with the Latin Church have asserted, that the Apostles all received the same commission and power from their Lord, with a primacy of order to St. Peter; and that all bishops are equally the successors of the Apostles, and equal in that authority which they derive from them¹. In consequence of these maxims they contend, that the idea of a visible Monarchy, such as is claimed to itself by the See of Rome, instituted by Christ over his faithful on earth, is repugnant to Scripture, and the sense and usages of the ancient Church. These points they have maintained with great force of reason and accuracy of research.

It is sufficient for my purpose to evince, that the Author of our Salvation has plainly shown, in the Revelation which he made to his Churches by St. John, that he has instituted no such Monarchy in Rome.

And thus much being clearly deduced from Scripture, the diadem of the Roman Pontif must part with another of its most brilliant jewels. His authority not being monarchical over the Church, the Infallibility of his chair must fall to the ground: for in any other character than that of

¹ See Febronius, No. 1. Contini, No. 3.

supreme head of the Church, it can be no more necessary to Him than to any other chief governor of it ; and will not, I presume, be pretended to belong to his order as episcopal, or his dignity as patriarchal. Indeed, his right to the sovereignty of the Church being unfounded, there needs no other argument than his constant claim of this right to prove that he is not infallible.

Yet his Supremacy and Infallibility are fundamental doctrines of the Roman Church, and are evidently assumed as certain in many of the Papal Bulls. Pius the Fourth, for instance, in a Bull confirming the Council of Trent, tells the Christian world, that it was by his permission, signified by his legates, that the Council had determined concerning the Sacraments and other matters ; that they had determined well, but concerning things that belonged to the peculiar authority of the apostolical See¹. Another of his Bulls contains a profession of faith, in which the twelve articles of the Apostles' Creed being first repeated, other articles of belief, equal at least in number, are subjoined ; and he ratifies this Bull in words to this effect : “ It is altogether unlawful for any
 “ man to infringe this publication of our will and
 “ mandate, or boldly and rashly to oppose it.
 “ And if any one shall attempt thus much, let
 “ him know that he will incur the indignation of
 “ Almighty God, and of his blessed Apostles Peter

¹ Bulls Papal, No. 3.

“ and Paul ¹.” The form of ratification is common in Papal Bulls, and is surely the language of Him who is persuaded that he is “ endued with “ power from on high” to determine the truth in matters of faith, and with authority to enforce his determinations with the sanctions of Heaven.

In these respects, They who subscribe themselves Catholic Dissenters to a petition lately presented to Parliament ², are dissenters from “ the “ mother and mistress of all Churches,” and call themselves Catholics with a disputable title: for the 26th of the Gregorian Dictates pronounces, that “ he is not to be accounted a Catholic, who “ does not agree with the Roman Church ³.” But these Petitioners say, among other things that intrench on the plenitude of power claimed by St. Peter’s successors, “ Your petitioners acknowledge “ no infallibility in the Pope:” which words, in the plain literal sense in which they declare they mean them, import no less, than that the Pope, deciding on questions and controversies of faith from his apostolical chair, may err. They who make such a declaration, though they have truth on their side, have the Head of their Church against them, and show a marked variation of religious opinions from the former, perhaps from many present, members of their Church in these kingdoms, but assuredly from all who adhere to

¹ Bulls Papal, No. 4.

² Presented to both Houses of Parliament May the 5th, 1789.

³ See Pontifs Roman, No. 4.

the principles of their last general Council ; which acknowledges the Pope to be Sovereign of the Church, and supposes him Infallible.

A writer, who in the year 1784 published his reasons for renouncing their Church, delivers his sentiments in these words : “ When all is said that possibly can be said, the Pope must be acknowledged by consistent Roman Catholics as the sole depositary of infallibility. For since the Council of Trent it is unanimously taught in all Roman-catholic Churches, that a Council can decree nothing without the consent of the Pope ; that he alone has a right to interpret the Council and explain its decisions ; and that those tenets only are of faith, which he determines to be so ¹.”

Whatever may be “ taught unanimously since the Council of Trent,” the language of that Council is decidedly in favour of the Supremacy and Infallibility of the Pope. The Trentine Fathers, many of whom were themselves bishops and archbishops, and some patriarchs, ascribe to the Pope the care of the universal Church *in virtue of his Office*, and speak of the supreme power in it committed to him ². In their decrees concerning reformation, notwithstanding their separate and collective rights, they make a reserve for the authority of the apostolical See ³. They enact

¹ See Watfon.

² Trent, Council of, No. 1, 2.

³ Ibid. No. 3.

also that all who have benefices with cure of souls shall promise and swear, that they will continue in obedience to the Roman Church¹; which holy Roman Church they allow to be the mother and mistress of all Churches: and as they were convened by authority of the Pope, so they speak of their Council as held or celebrated under him². These are manifest recognitions of his Supremacy over Them and the whole Church.

The same Council, having recited that they had deputed certain of their members to examine and report to them concerning books suspected or pernicious, and that this business was done, but that the holy Synod could not come to a distinct and proper decision upon it, on account of the variety and multitude of the books, decreed, that what had been performed by them should be laid before the most holy Roman Pontif, that by his judgement and authority it might be concluded, and made public; the same they ordered to be done with respect to the Catechism, that was to have been drawn up under the inspection of the Council, and with respect also to the Missal and Breviary³.

Setting aside the censuring of improper books, the composing of a Catechism that was to be a sure and authentic institution of belief and practice, and the revising of the most solemn offices of divine worship for general use and observance, were

¹ Trent, Council of, No. 4. ² Ib. No. 5, 6. ³ Ib.
undertakings

undertakings worthy the united wisdom of their assembly, which they consign to the Pope, to be completed by "his judgement and authority."

They supposed themselves to act in their synodical capacity under the immediate direction of Christ, and that their voice was the voice of the Holy Spirit¹. As guardians therefore of the Church and its faith, they could not have intrusted the perfecting of their labours into the hands of another, unless they had regarded him as illuminated with "the mind of Christ," able to explain his doctrines with certainty to his people, and to instruct them to speak as they ought to speak in their addresses to Heaven.

Not less deference did they testify to the Roman See at the closing of their Council: when all their decrees and canons having been read over, it was proposed that they should request the confirmation of them by "the most blessed Roman Pontif²." The proposal, unusual as it was³, met with the ready concurrence of the Fathers, who were then at Trent to the number of about two hundred and fifty five; only the archbishop of Granada dissenting; and in opposition to Him three bishops of his own nation declared that they requested the confirmation as *necessary*⁴.

Human wisdom and authority might have sufficed to confirm their regulations of discipline;

¹ Trent, Council of, No. 8.

² Ib. No. 9.

³ See Febronius, No. 2.

⁴ See Pallavicini.

but

but their canons and definitions of faith called for a higher sanction. They were to go forth to the Church as bearing the seal of infallible truth; and they applied to the Roman Pontif to set to them that seal by his ratification.

Nothing could have a stronger tendency to confirm the claims which they well knew he made to a Sovereignty over the whole Church, and to exemption from error in his public determinations, than such acts of a Council “lawfully congregated” “in the Holy Spirit,” as they speak of themselves¹, and sitting for the refutation of false opinions and the establishment of truth.

Now whether the Trentine Fathers ascribed so much to the Roman Pontif through a mistaken judgement, or by somewhat of a temporising spirit, which only the great Searcher of hearts can know assuredly, the propagation of error among their people is the same. And if they lead their friends astray in the material points, for such surely they are, of Supremacy and Infallibility, who can depend on the certainty of their decisions in any doctrine that has not the sanction of Holy Writ, but rests on the judgement of the Council, and the traditions of the Churches which they represented?

Safer and happier, I trust, are the devout sons and daughters of the Church of England: which

¹ Trent, Council of, No. 7.

proposes to their belief all that Scripture requires, interpreted in the fundamental articles of faith by primitive antiquity ; and allows nothing else to have strength and authority as necessary to salvation.

propose to their belief all that Scripture requires
interpreted in the fundamental articles of faith by
rational and sound; and allows nothing else to
have strength and authority as necessary to salva-

tion.

It is not to be understood that the above
principles are intended to be a complete
system of divinity, or to exhaust the
subject of the Christian religion. It is
only a statement of the principles which
the Church of England holds to be
essential to the Christian religion, and
which she holds to be the basis of
her doctrine and discipline. It is
not intended to be a complete system
of divinity, or to exhaust the subject
of the Christian religion. It is only a
statement of the principles which the
Church of England holds to be essential
to the Christian religion, and which she
holds to be the basis of her doctrine
and discipline.

"
"
"
"
"
OL
De
Ro
the
to

Lib
2
min

I N D E X

CONTAINING

AUTHORITIES AND SOME NOTES.

AUGUSTIN, St. p. 3.

" St. Augustine, Aretas, and other writers, commonly
" expound it, neither as Babylon itself, a city of Chaldea,
" or Ægypt, or any other city, which may be so called spi-
" ritually, as Hierusalem before chap xi. is named Spi-
" ritual Sodome and Ægypt, but of the general society of
" the impious," &c. Annotations on Rev. xvii. 5. in the
Old Rhemish Testament. Yet St. Augustin De Civitate
Dei, book xviii. chap. 2 and 22, calls Babylon the first
Rome, and Rome the second Babylon. And he is one of
the authorities to which Corn. a Lapide on the place refers
to show that Babylon means Rome.

BELLARMINE, Cardinal, p. 9, 12.

De Pontifice Romano.

1. Ipsis præcipue debet esse nota suæ sedis autoritas.
Lib. iv. c. 3.

2. Non est improbabile Petri sedem Romæ locatam Do-
mino jubente. Ib. ii. 12.

Deus

I N D E X.

Deus ipse jussit Romæ figi apostolicam Petri sedem.
Ib. iv. 4.

BONAMICI, Philip, p. 16, 24.

De claris Pontificiarum Epistolarum Scriptoribus. Romæ,
1753, 8vo.

1. Si quid in illo interitu atque occasu literarum reliquum fuit in scribendo humanitatis atque elegantia, Romæ certe atque in Pontificum Epistolis fuit; adeo ut eloquentia, quæ Romana vigente republica fuerat libertatis, facta esse quodammodo videretur alumna Religionis. p. 73.

2. Facile ut appareat Gregorii [VII.] Epistolas ejus esse, qui ampliorem quandam Pontificatus formam primus instituerit, quemadmodum Pontifices non solum colerentur ab regibus, sed etiam timerentur. p. 75.

BOSSUET, Messire Jacques Benigne,

Evesque de Meaux, p. 4, 27, 34.

L'Apocalypse avec une Explication. Paris, 1689, 8vo.

1. Avec des traits, si marquez, c'est une énigme aisée à déchiffrer, que Rome sous la figure de Babylon. Pref. No. vii. pag. 18.

2. Eglise, dont il n'y a aucun vestige dans tout son livre. Pref. No. x. p. 34.

3. Bossuet endeavours to prove that Babylon means Rome under the Pagan emperors, and that the final desolation of Babylon, predicted in the Revelation, took place when Alaric, commander of the Goths, took and sacked Rome, A. D. 410. p. 388, 398.

Calmet, in his *Bibliothèque Sacrée*, says, that this is one of the most esteemed explications of the Apocalypse; though it has met with a rough adversary, un rude adversaire, in the person of Vitringa.

Vitringa's book, to which Calmet refers, is intitled *Anacrisis Apocalypseos*. Francfort, 1705, 4to.

Another

I N D E X.

Another hypothesis concerning Babylon see under a Lapid.

BULLS, Papal.

I. Of *Pius V.* p. 10.

This Bull may be seen at length in Camden's *Annals of Queen Elizabeth*, under the year 1570, and in Burnet's *History of the Reformation*, Vol. II. *Collection of Records*, pag. 377.

Mr. Camden says, "The more moderate disapproved of this papal Bull; because no admonition, as ought of right, preceded it; and they foresaw the many evils that thence hung over themselves; who before had safely enough followed their own worship in their own houses, or without scruple of conscience had not refused to attend the service of the Church of England."

Some have asserted, that before the issuing of this Bull none of any persuasion refused to attend the service of the Church of England. This is denied in Dod's *Church History*, Vol. II. p. 397. Nor does Camden assert so much.

II. Of *Urban VIII.* p. 10.

The Bull, *In Cæna Domini*, is said to have been brought to its present state by Urban VIII. A copy of it, as published by Paul V. A. D. 1613, with a translation into English, may be found in the *Theological Works of Mr. Charles Leslie*, Vol. I. p. 544. It was published at Venice, A. D. 1769, 8vo. with *Reflections upon it* by an anonymous author, who shows at large the despotic spirit of it, invading the rights of sovereigns and subjects, laic and ecclesiastical. See under *Contini*.

III. Of *Pius IV.* p. 13, 31, 39.

I. Bull for the confirmation of the Oecumenical Council of Trent:

Si cui vero in eis aliquid obscurius dictum et statutum fuisse, eamque ob causam interpretatione aut decisione ali-

E

qua

I N D E X,

qua egere visum fuerit, *adscendat ad locum quem Dominus elegit*, ad sedem videlicet Apostolicam (Deut xvii.) omnium fidelium magistram.

2. Cum autem ipsa sancta Synodus pro sua erga Sedem Apostolicam reverentia, *antiquorum etiam Conciliorum vestigiis inherens*, decretorum suorum omnium, quæ nostro et prædecessorum nostrorum tempore facta sunt, confirmationem a nobis petierit, &c. *Ib.*

See under Febronius.

3. Nobis adeo Concilii libertati faventibus, ut etiam de rebus Sedi Apostolicæ proprie reservatis ipsi Concilio arbitrium per literas ad legatos nostros scriptas ultro permiserimus, quæ de Sacramentis et aliis rebus, quæ quidem necessariæ visæ sint, tractanda, definienda, et statuenda, restabant. *Ib.*

4. Bull in the form of a profession of faith to be made upon oath :

Nulli ergo hominum liceat hanc paginam nostræ voluntatis et mandati infringere, vel ei ausu temerario contraire. Si quis autem hoc intentare præsumperit, indignationem Omnipotentis Dei, ac beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum ejus, se noverit incursum.

BURNET, Bishop, p. 6.

Letters containing an account of what seemed most remarkable in Switzerland, Italy, &c. printed A. D. 1687.

CAVE, William, D. D.

Dissertation concerning the Government of the ancient Church. 8vo. London, 1683.

See under Boniface III. and Gregory VII.

CONSTANCE, Council of, p. 25.

It is well known that the Council of Constance, which opened about A. D. 1414, and the Council of Basil within twenty years after it, maintained the superiority of general Councils

I N D E X.

Councils over Popes. But not long after the Council of Florence declared the Pope head of the Church in terms that, according to Cardinal Orsi, Vol. II. p. 228, are inconsistent with the resolutions of those two Councils. Early in the next century, when the last Lateran Council was held, Leo X. published a Bull which rescinded those decrees of the Councils of Constance and Basil, that exalted general Councils above the Popes. Orsi, ib. p. 244. And he published this Bull, *sacro approbante Concilio*. See Orsi.

CONTINI, Padre, 24, 29, 38. Dell' ordine de Chierici Regolari Teatini, Teologo del Duca di Parma. To this author are ascribed

Riflessioni sopra la Bolla In Cœna Domini. 8vo. Venice, A. D. 1769.

1. According to this writer, whoever he was, the Bull *In Cœna Domini* is the genuine offspring of the dictates of Pope Gregory VII. in which Gregory declared himself absolute lord over temporals and spirituals, over emperors and kings, whom he could depose; over all the world, councils, bishops, and men's consciences: against whom alone lies no appeal, who only is infallible, alone subject to no reform. pag. 31.

2. Of those Dictates he says, p. 30, The question agitated among the critics is of little moment, whether Gregory himself put them together or not, since it is certain that they express his sentiments and maxims.

[See also Mosheim's Eccl. History, cent. xi. part ii. chap. ii. note.]

3. According to the same author, "As our Lord Jesus Christ deputed St. Peter to stand in his stead as his representative, so did he equally depute *the other* Apostles, committing to them an equal share on earth of his power which he had received from the Father. 'As my Father hath sent me, I also send you.' Successor of St.

I N D E X.

"Peter is the Roman Pontif; and successors of the Apostles are the Bishops in the very same manner, as St. Augustin hath observed." p. 82.

DALRYMPLE, Sir David, p. 27, 33.

An Inquiry into the secondary Causes which Mr. Gibbon has assigned for the rapid Growth of Christianity.

In this learned and valuable work is the following ingenious remark: "Here let it be observed in passing, that Laodicea was overthrown by an earthquake, A. U. C. 813, and that the Neronian persecution began A. U. C. 817. It is then not very probable that St. John would have addressed the Laodiceans as he does [Rev. ch. iii.] at ver. 17. had their city been ruined about five years before. This may contribute to support the very ancient tradition, that the Apocalypse was published under the persecution by Domitian." pag. 41. note.

FABRETTI, Raphael, p. 7.

De Aquis et Aquæductibus Veteris Romæ, 4to. Rome, A. D. 1680. See No. 263—266, &c.

FEBRONIUS, Justinus J. C. p. 38, 43.

De Statu Ecclesiæ et legitima Potestate Romani Pontificis, 4to. A. D. 1765.

The author, who takes the name of Febronius, is said to be John Nicolas ab Hontheim, Suffragan of Triers, born in Triers Jan. 29, 1701, and made bishop of Miriöfidi, in partibus, A. D. 1748.

1. Omnes Apostoli a Patribus, imo ab Ecclesia, Vicarii Christi appellantur, omnes eadem autoritate, eadem potestate a Christo donati sunt, illamque eodem modo, quo Petrus, exercuerunt, &c. p. 41.

2. Quantum ad Concilia generalia occidentis, quibus per legatos Papa adfuit, nullum noscitur quod miserit ad illum fuorum

I N D E X.

suorum gestorum relationes; unicum est TRIDENTINUM quod Pontificis confirmationem rogaverit. p. 39c.

Compare with this what Pius IV. says in his Bull of confirmation, that the Council acted thus, Antiquorum Conciliorum vestigiis inhærens.

GUTHERIUS, Jacobus, p. 15.

De vetere Jure Pontificio.

Romæ Æternæ, urbium principi, capiti orbis, virtutum dominæ, juris et æquitatis vindici, vetustatis miraculo venerando, victrici, potenti, augustæ, piæ, felici, æternum renascenti, æternum resurgenti. Ap. Cor. a Lapide in Apoc. xviii. 3.

JEROM, St. p. 37.

Æterna cum dicitur quæ temporalis est, nomen est blasphemix. Ad Algas. Quæstion. xi.

A LAPIDE, Cornelius, p. 4, 15, 33, 35.

1. Commentarii in Apocalypsim Sti. Johannis Apostoli. See in Apoc. xvii. 1, &c.

2. Roma ethnica sub Nerone et sequentibus Imperatoribus usque ad Constantinum fuit Babylon; sub Constantino facta Christiana et pia, desiit esse Babylon, cœpitque esse civitas sancta, urbs fidelis, Sion Deo dilecta, columen fidei, mater pietatis, magistra sanctitatis; sub finem mundi deferens fidem, pietatem, Christum, Pontificem, rursus fiet Babylon.

3. Aliud est Roma urbs, aliud Ecclesia Romana. Rursum: Aliud est Roma ethnica; aliud Roma Christiana, ib.

LIBER PONTIFICALIS, p. 12, seu, De Gestis Romanorum Pontificum. Romæ, 3 vol. 4to.

See under Sanctus Petrus.

I N D E X.

MARCELLINUS, Ammianus, p. 37.

Urbis æternæ Episcopi. Hist. lib. xv. cap. 7.

MEDALS, Imperial, p. 37.

Numismata Imperatorum Romanorum, D. Anselmi Banduri, 2 vol. Paris, 1718. where we see Romæ Æternæ on medals of Gallienus, Tacitus, Probus, Licinius, Constantine, and some other emperors.

“ There is one of the father [Gordian] not yet mentioned, which has for its reverse Rome, habited like a Pallas, with helmet, spear, and shield, holding out a victory on her right hand, and inscribed, Romæ Æternæ.”

Medallic History of Imperial Rome, by William Cooke, M. A. 2 vol. Lond. 1781. Vol. II. p. 322.

MEDALS, Papal, 19.

Numismata Romanorum Pontificum, per Radulphum Venuti. Romæ, 1744.

1. Reipublicæ Christianæ Rex ac Pater. Medal of Julius III. p. 14.

2. Gens et Regnum quod non servierit tibi peribit. Medal of the same, p. 26.

3. Gloriosa dicta sunt de te, Civitas Dei. Medal of Sixtus IV. The Pope opening the Gate at the Jubilee, A. D. 1475. See Psal. 86. aliter 87. p. 19.

4. Circumdate Sion. Medal of Paul III. See Psalm the same, p. 19.

5. Illuminare, Jerusalem. Medal of Pius V. See Isai. lx. 1. p. 19, 34.

6. Fundamenta ejus in montibus sanctis. Medal of Julius III. and Alexander VII. Psal 86, or 87. p. 19.

MENOCHIUS, Johannes Stephanus, p. 4, 35.

Trattenimenti eruditi, Vol. I. cent. 2. cap. 41.

Commentarii totius Sacræ Scripturæ.

Meretrix hæc, cui nomen est Babylon, ut dicitur infra
n. 5,

I N D E X.

n. 5, est Roma, non Christiana, qualis nunc est, sed infidelis et pagana, qualis fuit tempore Sti. Joannis, qualis futurum erit tempore Antichristi. In Apoc. xvii. 1.

MURATORI, Ludovico Antonio, p. 37.

Annali d'Italia, under the year of our Lord 324.

“ Few are the laws of Constantine in the present year, and these carry evidence in them that he was in Sirmium and Thessalonica. Nor is there the least appearance that he came to Rome, as Cardinal Baronius imagined; who records his baptism as having been received in that great City; relating the sumptuous Donation which it is pretended was made to the Roman Church by him; his leprosy, with other astonishing occurrences. At this day there is no man of letters who does not know that such facts are the fabulous inventions of later ages. And as it would be superfluous to say more about them, I shall not stop to expose their falsity.” Again under the year 337, which was the year of Constantine’s death, he shows that this emperor then received baptism in Nicomedia, at the hands of Eusebius, bishop of that city, and not in the year 324, from Pope S. Silvester.

A long declamation of Laurentius Valla exposing the barbarisms, incongruities, absurdities, and improbabilities, of that Donation, is printed in the Fasciculus Rerum, &c. Vol. I. pag. 132.

Nothing is here intended against the rights of the Popes as sovereigns of their temporal dominions. They possess them, though not by grant from Constantine, yet by a prescription of ages, and other titles, which at this day cannot justly be contested.

NEWTON, Sir Isaac, on the Prophecies of Daniel, p. 37.

In chapter viii. of this work, the edict of the emperor Valentinian III. is recited at length; in which the bishop of Rome is styled Papa Æternæ Urbis.

INDEX.

ORSI, F. Gius. Agostino, Cardinale, p. 11, 34, 37.
Della infallibilità e dell' autorità del Romano Pontifice.
Ristretto, 2 vol. 12mo. Rome, 1741.
Dell' origine del Dominio e della Sovranità de Pontifici
Romani, 12mo. Rome, 1754.

1. Che Gesù Cristo abbia istituita nella sua Chiesa la
Monarchia o forme di Governo Monarchico, e che di
questa Monarchia il supremo Capo sia il Romano Pontifice,
non è alcuno tra i Cattolici, il quale ardisca o possa ne-
garlo. Ristrett. Vol. II. p. 251.

2. In the second of these works, c. viii. pag. 117. he
shows that from A. D. 754, the Roman Pontifs alone have
had the supreme dominion of Rome; but he chooses to be
silent about Constantine's Donation.

PALLAVICINI, Sforza, Cardinale, p. 43.
Istoria del Concilio di Trenta. See lib. xxiv. cap. viii.
pag. 1026. tom. ii.

PLINY, Natural History, p. 7.

PONTIFCALE ROMANUM, Urbani VIII. Auctoritate re-
cognitum. Par. 1683, 8vo. p. 14.
De Consecratione Electi in Episcopum. Forma Juramenti,
p. 79.

PONTIFS, Roman.

I. Leo I. p. 15.

In Nativ. Apost. Petri et Pauli. Serm. I.

Isti sunt qui te ad hanc gloriam provexerunt, ut gens
sancta, populus electus, civitas sacerdotalis et regia, per sa-
crum beati Petri sedem caput orbis effecta latius præsideres
religione divina quam dominatione terrena.

II. Gregorius I. p. 23.

Mauritio Augusto:

Numquid

I · N · D · E · X ·

Numquid ego hac in re, piissime Domine, propriam causam defendo? Numquid specialem injuriam vindico? An non magis causam Omnipotentis Dei, et causam universalis Ecclesiæ. Epistolar. Lib. iv. Epist. 32.

Abfit a cordibus Christianorum illud nomen blasphemiae [Episcopus universalis] in quo omnium sacerdotum honos adimitur, dum ab uno sibi dementer arrogatur. Ib.

Eulogio Alexandrino :

Nullus unquam decessorum meorum hoc tam profano vocabulo uti consensit; quia videlicet si unus patriarcha universalis dicitur, patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur. Lib. iv. Epist. 36.

Joanni Episcopo Constantinopolitano :

Quid ergo, frater charissime, in illo terribili examine venientis judicii dicturus es, qui non solum Pater, sed etiam Generalis Pater in mundo, vocari appetis? Lib. iv. Ep. 38.

Mauritio Imperatori :

Ego autem fidenter dico, quia quisquis se Universalem Sacerdotem vocat vel vocari desiderat, elatione sua Antichristum præcurrit, quia superbiendo se cæteris præponit. Lib. iv. Epist. 30.

Eulogio Episcopo Alexandrino :

Ecce in præfatione Epistolæ, quam ad meipsum, qui prohibui, direxistis, superbæ appellationis verbum, me Papam Universalem dicentes, imprimere curastis. Quod peto dulcissima Sanctitas tua non ultra faciat: quia vobis subtrahimur quod alteri plus quam ratio exigit præbetur. Epist. Lib. vii. Ep. 30. In this Epistle is some account of the mission and success of Augustin among the Saxons in Britain, which is considered by Gregory as In mundi angulo posita, and, in mundi finibus.

These and the like declarations of Gregory proved very distressful to Cardinal Bellarmine; who not caring to contradict a Pope of such name, and whose authority and infallibility he was to maintain, endeavoured to explain and distinguish

I N D E X.

tinguish away his meaning : with what success the reader may judge by consulting the *Instructiones Historico-theologicæ* of the learned and pious John Forbes a Corse, D. D. Professor of Divinity in the university of Aberdeen in the time of Charles I. to whom he dedicated his work. Lib. xvi. cap. vii. §. 16—21.

III. BONIFACE III. p. 25.

“ Not long after Gregory [the First] dies, and Sabinian, who succeeded him, living not full six months, Boniface, the third of that name, takes the chair.—And now he thought it a fit time to put in for what the Popes, notwithstanding all the pretences of self-denial, so much desired.—From the very first entrance upon the papacy he dealt with Phocas about this matter, and at length gained the point.—And now that title that had so lately been *new, vain, proud, foolish, prophane, wicked, hypocritical, presumptuous, perverse, blasphemous, devilish and antichristian*, became in a moment not only warrantable, but holy and laudable, being sanctified by the apostolical See.”
Cave on Church Government, p. 326.

In the sixth chapter of this learned Dissertation the whole of this dispute between the Patriarchs of Rome and Constantinople is accurately related.

IV. GREGORY VII. p. 24, 40.

See his twenty-seven Dictates at the end of Cave on ancient Church Government.

V. PIUS II. Æneas Sylvius, of the Piccolomini family of Siena, p. 29.

He was Pope in the time of our Henry VI. and writing when he was a cardinal in vindication of the Papal Supremacy, observes, that before the Nicene Council, that is till A. D. 325, little deference was paid to the Roman Pontif.
Epist.

I N D E X.

Epist. 301. of the 4to Ed. of his Letters, printed at Leyden
A. D. 1497.

VI. PIUS IV. p. 13, 39. See under Bulls Papal, No. 3.

VII. PIUS V. p. 10. See Bulls Papal, No. 1.

VIII. URBAN VIII. p. 10. See Bulls Papal, No. 2.

STATO presente della Corte di Roma, 2 vols. 12mo.

Rome, 1765: p. 12, 13.

1. Vol. I. p. 179.

2. Vol. II. p. 5.

TRENT, Council of, p. 14, 41, 42.

1. Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinales—quorum consilio apud sanctissimum Romanum Pontificem cum universalis Ecclesiæ administratio nitatur. Canones et Decreta: Sessio xxv. cap. 1. De Reformatione.

2. Beatissimus Pontifex Romanus, quam sollicitudinem universæ Ecclesiæ in muneris sui officio debet, eam hic potissimum impendat, &c. Sess. xxiv. Norma Procedendi ad Creationem Episcoporum et Cardinalium, cap. 1.

Merito Pontifices maximi pro suprema potestate sibi in Ecclesia universa tradita causas aliquas criminum graviores suo potuerunt peculiari judicio reservare. Sess. xiv. cap. 7. De casuum reservatione.

3. Sacrosancta Synodus, iisdem præsentibus Legatis, inceptum Residentiæ et Reformationis negotium, ad Dei laudem et Christianæ Religionis incrementum prosequi intendens ut sequitur, statuendum censuit, salva semper in omnibus Sedis apostolicæ autoritate. Sess. vii. Decretum de Reformatione.

4. In Romanæ Ecclesiæ obedientia se permansturos spondeant ac jurent. Sess. xxiv. De Reformatione. cap. 12.

5. De indice librorum, et Catechismo, Breviario et Missali.

Sacro-

INDEX X.

Sacrofancta Synodus in secunda Sessione, sub sanctissimo Domino nostro Pio IV. celebrata, dilectis quibusdam patribus commisit, ut de variis censuris, ac libris, vel suspectis, vel perniciosis, quod factum opus esset, considerarent; atque ad ipsam sanctam Synodum referrent; audiens nunc, huic operi ab eis extremam manum impositam esse; nec tamen, ob librorum varietatem et multitudinem possit distincte et commode a sancta Synodo dijudicari; præcipit, ut quicquid ab illis præstitum sit sanctissimo Romano Pontifici exhibeatur: ut ejus judicio atque auctoritate terminetur et evulgetur. Idemque de Catechismo a Patribus, quibus illud mandatum fuerat, et de Missali et Breviario fieri mandat. Sess. xxv.

6. Sacrofancta Synodus in secunda Sessione, sub sanctissimo Domino nostro Pio IV. celebrata, &c. Continuatio Sessionis die iv. Decembris.

7. Sacrofancta, œcumenica, et generalis Tridentina Synodus, in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata. Sess. ii. and at the opening of the Sessions generally.

8. Non humanis quidem viribus confisa, sed Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui os et sapientiam Ecclesiæ suæ se daturum promisit, ope et auxilio freta. Sess. xviii. Feb. 26. 1562.

9. Hanc ergo non humanam sed Spiritus Sancti vocem audientes ne obdurent corda sua. De fine Concilii, et confirmatione petenda a sanctissimo Domino nostro. Ib.

TACITUS, Vita Agricolaë, p. 29.

VENUTI, Ridolphino, p. 6.

1. Numismata Pontificum Romanorum præstantiora, 4to. Rome, 1744. See Medals Papal.

2. Descrizione delle Antichità di Roma, 4to. Rome, 1763. Part ii. pag. 77.

3. De-

I N D E X.

3. Descrizione di Roma Moderna, 2 vol. 4to. Rome,
1766. v. i. p. 76.

WATSON, Charles Henry, p. 41.

Letter to the Roman Catholics of the City of Worcester.
London, 1784. note, pag. 27.

T H E E N D.